



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/515,760	03/01/2000	Kenneth W. Marr	303.650US1	2686

21186 7590 02/13/2002

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. BOX 2938
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER

OWENS, DOUGLAS W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2811

DATE MAILED: 02/13/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/515,760

Applicant(s)

MARR ET AL.

Examiner

Douglas W Owens

Art Unit

2811

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 January 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-52 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 19-26 and 47-52 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 and 27-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 March 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of the invention of group A, claims 1-18 and 27-46 in Paper No. 5 is acknowledged.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the third n+ region and third p+ region cited in claims 45 and 46 respectively must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. Claims 45 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claims 45 and 46 require that a third n+ region and a third p+ region be formed in the n-type well and the p-type well respectively. This feature is not disclosed in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-18 and 27-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US patent No. 5,742,555 to Marr et al. in view of US patent No. 5,811,869 to Seyyedy et al.

Regarding claim 1, Marr et al. teaches an antifuse comprising:

a well of first conductivity type (13);

a first conductive terminal (22); and

an insulator (20) between the well and the conductive terminal.

Marr et al. does not teach a first conductive terminal of the second conductivity type. It would have been a matter of obvious design choice to select a second conductivity type for the first conductive terminal since n-type and p-type conductive layers are known materials that are well suited for the intended use. Additionally, Seyyedy et al. teaches an antifuse structure wherein holes in the polysilicon layer (22) can provide a reliable contact between the gate (22) and the N-well (12) (Col. 3, lines 37-42).

Regarding claim 2, Marr et al. teaches an antifuse, further comprising an Ohmic contact (16).

Regarding claim 3, Marr et al. teaches an antifuse, wherein:

the substrate comprises p-type silicon;

the well is n-type;

the Ohmic contact is an n+ diffusion layer; and

the insulator layer is oxide.

Marr et al. does not teach an antifuse, wherein the conductive terminal is a layer of p-type polysilicon. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to select p-type polysilicon for reasons discussed above.

Regarding claim 4, Marr et al. teaches an antifuse, wherein:

the substrate is n-type;

the well is p-type;

the Ohmic contact is p+; and

the insulator is oxide.

Marr et al. does not teach an antifuse wherein the well is p+ type and the conductive terminal is n-type. It would have been a matter of obvious design choice to select an n-type or p-type terminal since both would have been capable of conducting a current after the oxide is broken down.

Regarding claim 5, Marr et al. teaches an integrated circuit (Fig. 6) comprising:

a first circuit;

a second circuit; and

an antifuse between the first and second circuit comprising:

a well of first conductivity type (13);

a first conductive terminal (22); and

an insulator (20) between the well and the conductive terminal.

Marr et al. does not teach a first conductive terminal of the second conductivity type. It would have been a matter of obvious design choice to select the second

Art Unit: 2811

conductivity type for the first conductive terminal since n-type and p-type conductive layers are known materials that are well suited for the intended use. Additionally, Seyyed et al. teaches an antifuse structure wherein holes in the polysilicon layer (22) can provide a reliable contact between the gate (22) and the N-well (12) (Col. 3, lines 37-42).

Regarding claim 6, Marr et al. teaches an integrated circuit further comprising an Ohmic contact as a second conductive terminal.

Regarding claim 7, Marr et al. teaches an integrated circuit, wherein:

the substrate comprises p-type silicon;

the well is n-type;

the Ohmic contact is an n+ diffusion layer;

the insulator layer is oxide;

the first circuit comprises a programming logic circuit; and

the second circuit comprises an external pin and a bias circuit (Col. 3, lines 29-35).

Marr et al. does not teach an antifuse, wherein the conductive terminal is a layer of p-type polysilicon. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to select p-type polysilicon for reasons discussed above.

Regarding claim 8, Marr et al. teaches an integrated circuit, wherein:

the substrate is n-type;

the well is p-type;

the Ohmic contact is p+;

Art Unit: 2811

the insulator is oxide;

the first circuit comprises a programming logic circuit; and

the second circuit comprises an external pin and a bias circuit.

Marr et al. does not teach an antifuse wherein the well is p-type and the conductive terminal is n-type. It would have been a matter of obvious design choice to select an n-type or p-type terminal since both would have been capable of conducting a current after the oxide is broken down.

Regarding claims 9 and 14, Marr et al. teaches an integrated circuit, wherein the integrated circuit comprises a memory device, an array of memory cells, an address decoder, a plurality of I/O paths, and an I/O control circuit (Fig. 5, Col. 4, lines 31-45).

Regarding claims 10 and 15, Marr et al. teaches an integrated circuit (Fig. 3) comprising:

a programming logic circuit;

an external pin; and

a plurality of antifuses, each antifuse comprising:

a well of first conductivity type (13);

a first conductive terminal (22); and

an insulator (20) between the well and the conductive terminal.

Marr et al. does not teach a first conductive terminal of the second conductivity type. It would have been a matter of obvious design choice to select a second conductivity type for the first conductive terminal since n-type and p-type conductive layers are known materials that are well suited for the intended

use. Additionally, Seyyedy et al. teaches an antifuse structure wherein holes in the polysilicon layer (22) can provide a reliable contact between the gate (22) and the N-well (12) (Col. 3, lines 37-42).

Regarding claims 11 and 16, Marr et al. teaches an integrated circuit, further comprising an Ohmic contact in the well coupled to the external pin.

Regarding claims 12 and 17, Marr et al. teaches an integrated circuit, wherein:
the substrate comprises p-type silicon;
the well is n-type;
the Ohmic contact is an n+ diffusion layer; and
the insulator layer is oxide.

Marr et al. does not teach an antifuse, wherein the conductive terminal is a layer of p-type polysilicon. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to select p-type polysilicon for reasons discussed above.

Regarding claims 13 and 18, Marr et al. teaches an integrated circuit, wherein:
the substrate is n-type;
the well is p-type;
the Ohmic contact is p+; and
the insulator is oxide.

Marr et al. does not teach an antifuse wherein the well is p-type and the conductive terminal is n-type. It would have been a matter of obvious design choice to select an n-type or p-type terminal since both would have been capable of conducting a current after the oxide is broken down.

Art Unit: 2811

Regarding claim 27, Marr et al. teaches a method comprising:
coupling a first programming voltage to a well of a first conductivity type; and
coupling a second programming voltage to a conductive terminal to create a
conductive path through the insulator between the conductive terminal and the well to
program the antifuse.

Marr et al. does not teach a conductive terminal of the second conductivity type.
It would have been a matter of obvious design choice to select a second conductivity
type for the conductive terminal since n-type and p-type conductive layers are known
materials that are well suited for the intended use. Additionally, Seyyedy et al. teaches
an antifuse structure wherein holes in the polysilicon layer (22) can provide a reliable
contact between the gate (22) and the N-well (12) (Col. 3, lines 37-42). The
incorporation of the teaching of Seyyedy et al., or a second type conductivity for the
conductive terminal would have produced an antifuse that could be programmed in the
same manner.

Regarding claims 28, 32 and 40, Marr et al. teaches a method, wherein coupling
a first programming voltage comprises coupling a first programming voltage to an
Ohmic contact in the well of the first conductivity type.

Regarding claims 29 and 41, Marr et al. teaches a method, wherein:
coupling a first programming voltage comprises coupling a very high voltage to
an n+ region; and
coupling a second programming voltage comprises coupling a ground voltage to
the conductive terminal (Col. 3, lines 63 and 64), wherein the antifuse is programming

Art Unit: 2811

by placing a potential across the thin oxide layer that is sufficient to rupture the oxide and short the well and conductive terminal together.

Marr et al. does not teach an antifuse, wherein the conductive terminal is a layer of p-type polysilicon. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to select p-type polysilicon for reasons discussed above.

Regarding claims 30 and 42, Marr et al. teaches a method, wherein any combination of can be utilized to provide the breakdown potential across the oxide layer. Marr et al. does not explicitly teach a method wherein a very negative potential is coupled to a p+ diffusion region and a supply voltage is coupled to the polysilicon layer. The combination of a negative potential to the p+ region and a supply voltage being coupled to the polysilicon layer is one of many combinations that would have provided a breakdown potential across the oxide layer. It would have been a matter of obviousness to select such a combination as a matter of design choice.

Marr et al. does not teach an antifuse wherein the well is p+-type and the conductive terminal is n-type. It would have been a matter of obvious design choice to select an n-type or p-type terminal since both would have been capable of conducting a current after the oxide is broken down.

Regarding claim 31, Marr et al. teaches a method of operating an integrated circuit comprising:

selecting an antifuse coupled between two circuits;

coupling a first programming voltage to a well of a first conductivity type; and

Art Unit: 2811

coupling a second programming voltage to a conductive terminal to create a conductive path through the insulator between the conductive terminal and the well to program the antifuse.

Marr et al. does not teach a conductive terminal of the second conductivity type. It would have been a matter of obvious design choice to select a second conductivity type for the conductive terminal since n-type and p-type conductive layers are known materials that are well suited for the intended use. Additionally, Seyyedy et al. teaches an antifuse structure wherein holes in the polysilicon layer (22) can provide a reliable contact between the gate (22) and the N-well (12) (Col. 3, lines 37-42). The incorporation of the teaching of Seyyedy et al., or a second type conductivity for the conductive terminal would have produced an antifuse that could be programmed in the same manner.

Regarding claims 33 and 37, Marr et al. teaches a method wherein:

the antifuse is selected from a plurality of antifuses coupled between a programming logic circuit and an external pin coupled to a bias circuit;

coupling a first programming voltage comprises coupling a very high voltage to the external pin that is coupled to an n+ region; and

coupling a second programming voltage comprises coupling a ground voltage from the programming logic circuit to the conductive terminal (Col. 3, lines 63 and 64), wherein the antifuse is programming by placing a potential across the thin oxide layer that is sufficient to rupture the oxide and short the well and conductive terminal together.

Art Unit: 2811

Marr et al. does not teach an antifuse, wherein the conductive terminal is a layer of p-type polysilicon. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to select p-type polysilicon for reasons discussed above.

Regarding claims 34 and 38, Marr et al. teaches a method wherein:

the antifuse is selected from a plurality of antifuses coupled between a programming logic circuit and an external pin coupled to a bias circuit; and

wherein any combination of can be utilized to provide the breakdown potential across the oxide layer.

Marr et al. does not explicitly teach a method wherein a very negative potential is coupled to a p+ diffusion region and a supply voltage is coupled to the polysilicon layer. The combination of a negative potential to the p+ region and a supply voltage being coupled to the polysilicon layer is one of many combinations that would have provided a breakdown potential across the oxide layer. It would have been a matter of obviousness to select such a combination as a matter of design choice.

Marr et al. does not teach an antifuse wherein the well is p+-type and the conductive terminal is n-type. It would have been a matter of obvious design choice to select an n-type or p-type terminal since both would have been capable of conducting a current after the oxide is broken down.

Regarding claim 35, Marr et al. teaches a method of operating an integrated circuit comprising:

selecting an antifuse coupled between a circuit and an external pin;

coupling a first programming voltage to the external pin that is coupled to the well of a first conductivity type; and

coupling a second programming voltage from the circuit to a conductive terminal to create a conductive path through the insulator between the conductive terminal and the well to program the antifuse.

Regarding claim 36, Marr et al. teaches a method, wherein coupling a first programming voltage comprises coupling a first programming voltage the external pin coupled to an Ohmic contact in the well of the first conductivity type.

Regarding claim 39, Marr et al. teaches a method comprising:

selecting circuits to be coupled together;

programming an antifuse using a method comprising:

coupling a first programming voltage to a well of a first conductivity type; and

coupling a second programming voltage to a conductive terminal to create a conductive path through the insulator between the conductive terminal and the well to program the antifuse.

Marr et al. does not teach a conductive terminal of the second conductivity type. It would have been a matter of obvious design choice to select a second conductivity type for the conductive terminal since n-type and p-type conductive layers are known materials that are well suited for the intended use. Additionally, Seyyedy et al. teaches an antifuse structure wherein holes in the polysilicon layer (22) can provide a reliable contact between the gate (22) and the N-well (12) (Col. 3, lines 37-42). The incorporation of the teaching of Seyyedy et al., or a

second type conductivity for the conductive terminal would have produced an antifuse that could be programmed in the same manner.

Regarding claim 43, Marr et al. teaches a method of forming an antifuse comprising:

- forming a well of first conductivity type (13);

- forming a first conductive terminal (22); and

- forming an insulator (20) between the well and the conductive terminal.

Marr et al. does not teach forming a first conductive terminal of the second conductivity type. It would have been a matter of obvious design choice to select a second conductivity type for the first conductive terminal since n-type and p-type conductive layers are known materials that are well suited for the intended use. Additionally, Seyyed et al. teaches an antifuse structure wherein holes in the polysilicon layer (22) can provide a reliable contact between the gate (22) and the N-well (12) (Col. 3, lines 37-42).

Regarding claim 44, Marr et al. teaches method of forming an antifuse, further comprising forming an Ohmic contact (16) as a second conductive terminal.

Regarding claim 45, Matt et al. teaches a method wherein forming the well comprises forming an n-type well in a p-type silicon substrate and further comprising:

- forming an n+ diffusion region (19);

- forming an n+ drain region (18);

- forming an n+ source region (19);

- forming an oxide (20) between the source and drain diffusion regions; and

Art Unit: 2811

forming a conductive terminal (22) over the oxide.

Marr et al. does not teach an antifuse, wherein the conductive terminal is a layer formed of p-type polysilicon. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to select p-type polysilicon for reasons discussed above.

Regarding claim 46, Matt et al. teaches a method wherein forming the well comprises forming a p-type well in a n-type silicon substrate and further comprising:

forming a p+ diffusion region (21);

forming an p+ drain region;

forming an p+ source region;

forming an oxide (20) between the source and drain diffusion regions; and

forming a conductive terminal (22) over the oxide.

Marr et al. does not teach a method wherein a p+-type well is formed an n-type conductive terminal is formed. It would have been a matter of obvious design choice to select an n-type or p-type terminal since both would have been capable of conducting a current after the oxide is broken down.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Douglas W Owens whose telephone number is 703-308-6167. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Thomas can be reached on 703-308-2772. The fax phone numbers for

Application/Control Number: 09/515,760


Page 15

Art Unit: 2811

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7722 for regular communications and 703-308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

DWO
February 6, 2002


TOM THOMAS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800